

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Juergen Einspenner et al.

Serial No.: 10/528,035

Filed: December 16, 2005

Docket No.: I431.125.101/FIN249PCT/US

Title: METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE ARRANGEMENT OF CONTACT AREAS ON THE ACTIVE TOP SIDE OF A SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed July 24, 2007. Claims 14-22 and 29-37 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 23-28 were rejected. Claims 23-28 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Election Requirement

The Office Action noted that claims 23-28 were previously elected for examination in response to the election requirement. Accordingly, the status of non-elected claims 14-22 and 29-37 has been changed to “Withdrawn.”

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Fee et al., US Patent 6,773,960 (“Fee”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

It is well accepted that, to anticipate a claim, the cited reference must disclose each claim element. MPEP 2131. Applicants submit that Fee fails to disclose each of the limitations recited by independent claim 23. First, claim 23 is directed to “a method for determining the arrangement of contact areas.” In contrast, Fee discloses “methods for **forming a slot** with a laterally recessed area at an end thereof through an interposer or other carrier substrate,” as entitled (emphasis added). MPEP 2111.02 (citing *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165-66 (Fed. Cir. 1999)) states, “if the claim preamble is necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality to the claim, then the claim preamble should be construed as if in the balance of the claim.” The sections of Fee cited in the Office Action appear to relate to the final arrangement of the contact areas as illustrated in the figures, rather than determining the arrangement of such contact areas.

The Office Action does not provide a citation to Fee identifying the method by which the arrangement of contact areas was determined. Fee instead discloses methods of fabricating interposers (col. 3, line 61), forming slots (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 15, col. 6, lines 26-40) and

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Juergen Einspennner et al.

Serial No.: 10/528,035

Filed: December 16, 2005

Docket No.: I431.125.101/FIN249PCT/US

Title: METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE ARRANGEMENT OF CONTACT AREAS ON THE ACTIVE TOP SIDE OF A SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP

assembling semiconductor devices (col. 7, line 60 – col. 8 line 6). Although Fee does disclose contact areas, the Office Action does not identify where Fee teaches a method for determining the arrangement of contact areas on the active top side of a semiconductor chip.

Further, independent claim 23 includes “reading semiconductor chip data into the computer system,” “reading contact area data into the computer system,” “reading housing data into the computer system,” as well as “reading production data into the computer system.” Additionally, independent claim 23 includes “generating a model of an electronic device.” Fee teaches methods for **assembling** an interposer with a semiconductor die and for **forming** a package that includes the interposer (col. 3, lines 16-17). Fee fails to teach reading data into a computer system for determining the arrangement of contact areas. Regarding these claim elements, the Office Action generally refers to Figures 1-5 of Fee. However, none of the cited Figures of Fee appear to illustrate a computer system at all, and these figures certainly do not appear to illustrate a computer system into which data regarding the semiconductor chip are read. In fact, a text search of the Fee reference finds no use of the terms *computer* or *program*.

In summary, Applicants believe the Fee reference fails to disclose each claim limitation of independent claim 23. As such, Fee cannot anticipate independent claim 23, or any of the claims dependent on claim 23. All of the pending claims are therefore believed to be proper for allowance.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Juergen Einspenner et al.

Serial No.: 10/528,035

Filed: December 16, 2005

Docket No.: I431.125.101/FIN249PCT/US

Title: METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE ARRANGEMENT OF CONTACT AREAS ON THE ACTIVE TOP SIDE OF A SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 23-28 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 23-28 are respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0471.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Mark L. Gleason at Telephone No. (612) 767-2503, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Dicke, Billig & Czaja
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Respectfully submitted,

Juergen Einspenner et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2000
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/23/2007

MLG:alm

/Mark L. Gleason/

Mark L. Gleason

Reg. No. 39,998